UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Louis L. Mann, Curtis W. Reese, *Associate Editors*

Unitarianism and Freedom

By RAYMOND H. PALMER

The Sword of Damocles

By SYDNEY STRONG

A Case of Mistaken Strategy

By GEORGE H. SHOAF

Thoughts About Europe

By EWART EDMUND TURNER

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 15

Chicago, June 13, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*
Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 227
Unitarianism and Freedom—RAYMOND H. PALMER 229
Jottings—J. H. H. 231

ARTICLES—
Bernard Shaw on Prohibition 227
The Sword of Damocles—SYDNEY STRONG 232
A Case of Mistaken Strategy—GEORGE H. SHOAF 234
Thoughts About Europe—EWART EDMUND TURNER 235

POETRY—
The Bureaucrat at the Dinner Table—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS .. 236

THE STUDY TABLE—
War's Horrors—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 237
A Book of Poems—ROBERT BURNS BAIR 237
Do We Need Religion?—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 238

CORRESPONDENCE—
From a Gandhi Disciple—in Jail—P. 238
"Looking Backward"—ERMINA MOORE 239
The "Movies" and Peace—RALPH CHEYNEY 239

THE FIELD—
Gandhi and the Missionary—*Quaker World Service* 226
A Contest for Best Peace Plank 240

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Gandhi and the Missionary

A Conference between Mr. Gandhi and Representatives of British Missionary Societies, held 8th October, 1931.

Unfortunately space does not permit us to print in full the verbatim report of this very interesting gathering, but after some preliminary discussion on the misunderstanding of Mr. Gandhi's attitude toward Missions through erroneous press reports and a statement of Mr. Gandhi's with regard to conversion from one faith to another which he strongly disapproves, the discussion continued as follows:

The Rev. Godfrey Phillips, of the London Missionary Society, said:

"I wish we could understand one another better with regard to what is happening amongst the 'untouchables' in connection with Christian missions. . . . We have found in our experience that when the real 'untouchable,' the outcast, is down and out, we can do nothing permanent except by implanting in his inmost heart something that has vitalizing power—in our experience that is fellowship with God in Christ. We can only get at them in a community. We are with the Mahatma in his feeling for the hungry masses. We are with him in his desire to remove untouchability, but we feel also that we must put inside the outcast something that will work inside him for always. Can we not understand each other better? Sometimes when we try to get land for our work, it is the Mahatma's followers who prevent us. Even if the Mahatma does not wish us to convert, our belief in conversion is due to the fact that we really can see no other way."

Mr. Gandhi:

"I honor Mr. Phillips for his question. I don't want to prevent by legislation or force the work of converting, but I wish I could convince Mr. Phillips and other missionaries that in my own humble opinion it is an erroneous way. He has used my analogy of the rose. He says that the missionaries have to take, as it were, a rose to the 'untouchables.' I would call him a walking rose, and he does not need to be anything more. He does not need to talk about God because these men would be able to see God somewhere written in him and in his conduct, just as if the rose were planted in front of the pariah's house; it would silently spread its scent. The rose would not have to speak, neither would the Christian missionary have to speak. If Mr. Phillips thinks that before he can come to the help of the 'untouchables' he must bring the message of God, or the message of the Bible to the 'untouchables,' how much more then to a man like me. I press this point after having mixed with tens of thousands of 'untouchables,' and done much work of this kind. They do not understand his language.

(*Continued on page* 239)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1932 Number 15

BERNARD SHAW ON PROHIBITION

As far as the direct results of the experiment are concerned, Prohibition has proved absolutely and convincingly satisfactory. Even the men who buy liquor from bootleggers for their own consumption vote Prohibition because they realize the direct beneficial results which have accrued to the community by the experiment.

But some of the indirect results of Prohibition in America have been very troublesome indeed. . . But it is by no means a convincing reason for going back on it. It is certainly a very serious reason for reestablishing law and order, and it involves also an extensive interference with private enterprise. The position is one which has been brought about by the enormous toleration which exists in America for any form of commercial adventure, irrespective of whether it is consistent with the public welfare or not. . . The question which Americans have to face is: "Is your civilization going to be beaten by the liquor trade?" It is a problem for which I have no immediate solution.

Now to take the other extreme. The other day I visited a country called Russia in which all the difficulties caused by the American toleration of private enterprise in conflict with public interest have completely vanished. The maximum lifetime of a gangster or profiteer, if he started his activities in Russia, I should put at about ten minutes. You could not possibly get in Russia the state of bribery and intimidation that exists in America.

—*Bernard Shaw,* in *New York Herald-Tribune.*

We are getting more and more intensely uninterested as the presidential campaign draws on apace. There is nothing exciting, surely, in Mr. Hoover, who is certain to be the candidate on the Republican ticket. The Democratic "free-for-all" promises the usual turmoil, but with no outcome on the part of either candidate or platform calculated to stir the blood. The utter failure of the Progressives either to dispute the leadership of the two old parties, or to organize a so-called third party, is strictly "according to Hoyle," but disheartening none the less. The Socialists are aggressive and hopeful, but they have no money, little effective organization, and even in these bad times cannot be expected to do anything more than roll up their usual unprecedented minority vote. Why any intelligent person, outside the ranks of the professional politicians and the families of the candidates, should be interested in this forthcoming election, we cannot imagine. Why anybody should be interested in any election under present conditions in America, passes our comprehension. We are told that every good citizen should vote. But why? Do we want another four years of President Hoover? Only as a means of escaping the humiliation and disaster of four years of Democratic rule! Perhaps we should stand up and vote the Socialist ticket, not with the idea of accomplishing anything, but as a protest against the continuance of the rule of decrepitude and dishonor in both the historic parties. But, if protest is our aim, why not stay home, and say, "A plague on both your houses"? Personally, we have no more zeal for staying at home than for going to the polls. We shall vote as a matter of habit, and also of conviction, for the Socialists, especially since the candidate is Norman Thomas. But what we want to say is that political conditions in this country are about as shameful as they can be, and ought to arouse the whole body of citizenry to revolt.

We are amazed that the government accomplishes nothing in the matter of relieving this unprecedented economic depression. But what can the government do? Surely, President Hoover can no longer be accused of false optimism, or dumb inactivity, or mild indifference. On the contrary, he is worn with anxiety, and during these last few months has presented policies and put them determinedly into effect. But these policies have accomplished nothing. The situation is as bad as, or worse than, ever. But why should we expect anything else? Why turn to Washington at all? Are we such "boobs," to use the almost forgotten Menckenian lingo, that we do not know that government no longer has any basic power in this modern world? Not politics but economics are central in the affairs of men today, and it is the industrialists and not the politicians who can help. Only when government takes over industrial as well as political power—controls property and production, in other words, as in Soviet Russia—can the political institutions of the nation be expected to achieve anything in the public interest at such a time as this. Meanwhile, we are in the hands of the propertied class who pretend not to know what to do, but as a matter of fact are thoroughly aware of what is wrong. They understand perfectly well that we must have a planned instead of a hit-and-miss economy, a cooperative instead of a competitive system of production, a wider and juster distribution of wealth. But a change, a revolution to

this end means a surrender of the enormous power which the present masters of industry now possess and exercise in their own interest. It is true that, in the present collapse of values, capital as well as labor is suffering stupendous loss, and may eventually plunge into utter catastrophe. But our great industrialists have learned to be gamblers, and they had rather stake all on "getting by" in this crisis whatever the cost, than by surrendering their power and possession, establish a new and ordered society which would make such a crisis forever impossible in the future. Rather perish as dead kings, than survive as mere citizens of a commonwealth!

It is because our great capitalists are at the center of responsibility in this crisis, in so far as personal responsibility for so stupendous a catastrophe can be placed at all, that these same capitalists are making such desperate efforts to saddle the blame on some one else. It is just here that Congress is the easy mark. Why all this uproar against House and Senate? Sweeping through the nation, urged on by the yappings of the press, is this perfect furor of indignation against the politicians. Is it possible that we do not see that this excitement is all the result of propaganda skilfully directed by the industrial and financial leaders of the country to the end of diverting public attention from their own great success in bringing on the crisis, and their own gross failure to do anything to relieve it? This is the charge leveled, and rightly leveled, by no less a man than John Dewey in his recent letter to the progressive Senators on behalf of the People's Lobby, of which he is president. "Concentrated wealth and privilege," says Professor Dewey, "are making a deliberate attempt to discredit Congress," the more surely to distract attention from their own plottings and plannings against the public weal. As a matter of fact Congress has not done so badly. The House rebellion against the sales tax was a magnificent assertion of power which the bankers and brokers thought they had long since stolen for their own uses. Now comes the deliberate attempt to demoralize the people, overwhelm House and Senate with wild abuse, and thus to command the situation. If anything could make this assertion certain it is the immediate reappearance, in the wake of the storm, of the move to lower the income tax in the upper brackets and to *restore the sales tax*. Democracy today is fighting for its life. Congress, whatever its defects and weaknesses, is the only bulwark of the people we have left. Our big business men, having messed up everything, would now take advantage of the resulting chaos, to save their own interests, whatever else goes. Fascism seems not so far away!

The House of Representatives, acting upon the report of its Committee on Military Affairs (see UNITY, May 23rd, page 179), refused to save $6,000,000 by suspending operations of the R. O. T. C. and the Citizens Military Training Camps as recommended by the Committee. It is true, of course, that $6,000,000 is no great amount of money in a national budget totaling billions, but the way to save is to *save,* and we can imagine no better place to begin than with the enormous military expenditures of the Government. It is to be noted, in fairness, that the House acted favorably upon the recommendation to retire 2,000 army officers from active service, which is all to the good. But just for this reason is it the more amazing that the Training Corps and the Training Camps should be retained. Of all the military work carried on by the War Department, none fails so miserably as these. Their purpose is to recruit reserve officers for the army. But statistics show that, in spite of lavish expenditures, results are meager in the extreme. What we have in Corps and Camps is simply a first-class piece of propaganda for militarism. General Summerall, until recently Chief of Staff, gave the whole show away when he said that the principal usefulness of these activities was to woo public goodwill. Well, in the piping days of prosperity, this may be legitimate enough. But in times like these, when the nation is all but bankrupt, what are we to think of the irresponsibility of a House which votes away six times a million dollars to give sporting college boys uniforms, guns and ponies, and idle bank-clerks and brokers a month's holiday in the country? This is not war, nor preparation for war; it is just plain debauchery and waste. But the military lobby did its work well, and so the bills got through. Now what will the Senate do?

We wish for his own sake that J. Ramsay MacDonald would resign his premiership and retire forthwith to private life. In saying this we have in mind not merely his physical health, which is serious, but also his moral health, which is more serious. If his eyes are going blind, it is only as a kind of parable of that loss of inner vision which constitutes one of the major tragedies of contemporary history. There is something so pitiful about the present spectacle that we cannot feel disgust or anger any more, but only that deep-seated sense of hurt which comes from some vast experience of disillusionment. It is bad enough simply to look at MacDonald in his present setting—the old Laborite surrounded by his hard-shell Tories! But it is worse—indeed, almost unbearable—to see his performances and hear his words. Could anything be baser, for example, than his attack upon De Valera—his apparently deliberate misstatement of the issue involved in the matter of the oath of allegiance to the King, and his patronizing sneer at Irish aspirations for perfect liberty? Yes—baser than this was the Prime Minister's recent denunciation of the Indian

Nationalists and his defense of British tyranny under the present rule of Lord Willingdon. MacDonald, who has again and again pled for complete freedom for India, now becomes not only the mouth-piece but the instrument of the foulest oppression that the world has known since the black days of the Tsar!

"How are the mighty fallen," cried David, in lament over the tragic death of Saul and Jonathan; and then immediately he continued,

—"and the weapons of war perished."—It is the impending defeat of MacDonald's policies that lends the final touch of tragedy to his spiritual death.

Our Methodist brethren are under heavy fire on the Prohibition question, but if they are one-half, or even one-quarter, as enlightened in their "dry" attitude as they are in their attitude toward other problems of our day, then Prohibition is in good hands. Take the action of the Methodists, for example, on the war and peace question as registered at their great conference at Atlantic City. First and foremost, they declared that the German nation could no longer be held solely responsible for the World War, and thus demanded the revision of Article 231 of the Versailles Treaty in accordance with the facts of history. They then proceeded to follow the logic of this statement by asserting that, "since the alleged sole guilt of Germany no longer could be maintained, further reparations based upon that assumption should not be demanded." Pointing out that reparations are closely related to war debts, the conference urged "the Government of the United States, inviting the cooperation of other governments which are involved, to arrange a new settlement of war debts based upon the present economic situation, upon drastic reduction of armaments and of military expenditures." The conference commended the President and Secretary of State for refusing to recognize treaties and agreements made in violation of treaty agreements, thereby sustaining the Briand-Kellegg Pact as over against Japan; called upon the United States to "ratify the World Court protocols, and also to enter the League of Nations with such Senate reservations as shall harmonize the constitution of the League with the Paris Peace Pact"; proposed the creation of a bureau in the Department of State "to promote education for peace"; demanded that alien pacifists be not barred from citizenship because of conscientious objection to war; and petitioned the Government to abolish all military training in civilian educational institutions. Here is a pretty complete program of reform. If Democrats and Republicans in this country had a modicum of the statesmanship of these Methodists, this old world of ours might save itself before it is too late.

Unitarianism and Freedom

I was ordained to the Baptist ministry in 1913 at the age of 19. After nearly five years of continuous preaching in that denomination, I came to the conclusion that my opinions were out of harmony with the tenets of the Baptist church, and I withdrew. The manner in which this came about is interesting. A friend of mine, who was a prominent layman in the church, advised me not to leave the Baptist ministry. Unable to convince me himself, he arranged an interview between me and the Rev. George W. Truett, a well known Baptist clergyman of Dallas, Texas. My friend went with me to see Dr. Truett. The latter asked me if I believed in God. I replied, "Not in a God who hears and answers prayers." Dr. Truett then said, "You had better go into the Unitarian church, for you will never be at home in the Baptist minstry."

Acting upon Dr. Truett's advice and upon my own impulses, I then read the sermons of William Ellery Channing and other noted Unitarian divines. These elevating utterances moved me profoundly, and after a few weeks, I found myself a student in the Meadville theological school at Meadville, Pennsylvania, in training for the Unitarian ministry. Subsequently I held Unitarian pastorates in Hinsdale (Illinois), Duluth (Minnesota), and Lynn (Massachusetts). Now, after nearly five years in the Baptist church and almost a decade in the Unitarian fellowship, I have come to the conclusion that I ought not longer to continue in the pulpit. This decision, reached at the age of thirty-seven, and after nearly twenty years of devotion to the ideals of two great churches, has brought me much pain and disappointment. Why is it, I ask myself, that a man who has sincerely loved the church, at least as an ideal, feels compelled to withdraw entirely from organized religion in order to satisfy his own longings for a life of strict sincerity and spiritual integrity?

It would seem that the Unitarian church, which has for a century maintained a tradition of liberalism in America, might offer to a person who believed in the mission of prophetic preaching without dogmatic restraints an opportunity for religious leadership in an atmosphere of perfect freedom. There are many Unitarians in America today who profess to believe that their church does offer an example of a religious fellowship founded and maintained upon a basis of absolute liberty of thought and utterance. So far as I have been able to determine, from an active connection with Unitarianism for ten years, there are no grounds for the hope that a free and untrammeled spirit will find himself any more at home there, in active pulpit performance, than he would in any other

body of organized religionists whose temper and ideas did not agree with his own.

Unitarianism was organized as a gentlemanly protest against what are now generally considered to have been the harsh features of Calvinistic theology in America a century ago. Unitarianism continues to this very hour to be just that and nothing more.* But it claims, strangely enough, to be much more. These claims are spurious. They are based upon the false assumption that when a person has found liberty from the dogmatic tenets of orthodox Christianity he has all the liberty that he needs for the full and free exfoliation of his mind and spirit. But the spirit of freedom, once evoked, is not likely to be satisfied with a single victory over dogmatism, and that is the reason why Ralph Waldo Emerson and Theodore Parker, and John Haynes Holmes in our own day, have withdrawn from the Unitarian church or have been unkindly treated by its adherents.

There are two kinds of liberals in religion. There are those who become dissatisfied with a certain doctrine or set of doctrines, as the Unitarians did with the doctrines of hell, and salvation by grace, and the infallibility of the Bible, and in order to give an appearance of philosophical profundity to their protest, such persons champion the principle of liberty as a means of gaining the particular freedom which they desire. After such persons have got what they want, they settle down to enjoy it, and in order to enjoy it to the full, they tacitly assume that the liberties which they have gained are the only liberties worth having. The principle of liberty, once so profoundly proclaimed as the philosophical ground for their protestant movement, is then confined to operation in the very narrow field where its application secures what its champions desire for themselves. This is one kind of liberalism, and on the whole, that is the kind of liberalism which the Unitarian church in America has practiced. But so ardently did this church espouse the abstract principle of freedom in order to free itself from the clutches of Calvinism, and so eloquently did its leaders defend that principle, that almost before the church had got itself established it was doomed to impotency because of the conflict between this principle and the desire of the rank and file of Unitarians to sit back and enjoy what they had gained by the application of the principle to a restricted area.

I was led into the Unitarian church by the supposition that it was really a fellowship of liberals of another kind entirely. I supposed that I should find in that church a group of people who were intensely interested in helping one another grow under the continual inspiration of the principle of freedom continuously evoked and constantly applied to every problem of life, both personal and social, as it arose. I soon found that I was mistaken. I found it to be true that all the members of the church tacitly assumed that freedom prevailed, but most of them either stupidly albeit sincerely thought that freedom meant freedom only from what other churches, like the Catholic or the Fundamentalists, believed, or they had a kind of gentlemen's understanding that the principle of freedom was not to be pushed so far by any individual within the church as to make of himself a disturbing factor in the even flow of the church's life. I found on every hand specious arguments in support of this latter adjustment. An example of this may be quoted from a letter by a prominent Unitarian clergyman, Franklin C. Southworth, for many years president of the Meadville theological seminary, who writes in the *Christian Century* of February 24, 1932, that "for a minister to disclaim in effect any responsibility for the promotion of the purpose for which his people have united, and to affirm that his only responsibility is to himself, for proclaiming in season and out of season the truth as he sees it, means that he conceives of ministers as a privileged class, for which there is no place in a modern democracy."

Dr. Southworth's statement shows clearly where I made my mistake in entering the Unitarian church. I supposed that a minister in that church performed the whole of his responsibility to the church *by being true to himself*. I supposed this was, indeed, the only obligation which the church laid upon either its clergy or its laity, namely, the obligation of the strictest moral and spiritual responsibility to one's self. But when this statement by Dr. Southworth was given wide publicity, it provoked, so far as I know, no protest whatever from the members of the Unitarian fellowship. That leads me to believe that the principle "to thine own self be true . . . thou canst not then be false to any man" is not accepted in Unitarian circles as being the essence of Unitarianism. There is something higher than one's self to which one owes responsibility in the Unitarian church, and according to Dr. Southworth, that something higher is the opinion of the majority of the congregation. A minister is not, as I erroneously supposed, to proclaim the truth as he sees it in season and out of season. For such there is not only no place in the Unitarian church, but as Dr. Southworth says, for such "there is no place in a modern democracy."

I have no quarrel with this doctrine as applied to the Unitarian church or any other church so long as the matter is made perfectly clear and unambiguous. It is made so in the Catholic church. But it is far different in the Unitarian fellowship. The latter body does a great deal to convince people that it is a church whose members, both clergy and laity, are morally responsible to no one but themselves, and that the deepest moral turpitude is found exactly at that point

*Note the statement of President Cornish, at the recent A. U. A. meeting, that Unitarianism is a protest against an angry God.—Editor.

where a person either through silence or false utterance is unfaithful to "the truth as he sees it."

It seems to me that Dr. Southworth has laid bare the reason why the Unitarian church has no hold upon the allegiance of the liberals in America which is at all commensurate with its claims as a free church. For a church to base its existence upon the principle of freedom, and then, through timidity and specious regard for practical considerations, to twist that principle into meaningless construction, is no way to gain the allegiance of people to whom the principle is actually sacred. I loved the Unitarian church so long as I believed that it was or strove to become the embodiment of that principle. I am a religious man. My mind and spirit are much under the sway of religious impulses. I have long cherished the ideal of a society of men and women whose liberality of spirit would make it possible, indeed practicable, for them to have fellowship together on no other basis than that of strict sincerity, honest speaking and mutual toleration. This may be too much to expect in a degree sufficiently widespread to make it the cornerstone of any attempt at organized religion. The Unitarians have made the finest and altogether the noblest attempt at it yet made in the history of ecclesiasticism. But the fruit of their effort is pitiable, and the only reason why it does not more readily appear so to the casual observer is because Unitarianism is the ecclesiastical dream come to nought of the participants in the only intellectual renaissance which America has ever had. I mean, of course, that the Unitarian church is the ecclesiastical concomitant of what has been called by Lewis Mumford "the golden day" in American literature. It was the result in the field of organized religion of the same forces which produced the New England galaxy of writers of whom Emerson is the most conspicuous. That was a powerful strain. Unitarianism was its religious flowering, and the Unitarian church points with pride to the number of people in "Who's Who" that have had some connection with this church during the past two or three generations. They are a considerable number, those sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters of a noble generation, and they have built many worthy monuments to themselves, but their enthusiasm for the principle of freedom in religion grows feebler and feebler with the passage of time.

If the people in "Who's Who" who give their church connection as Unitarian were examined on the basis of their *enthusiasm* for this church, I suspect that we should find out why it is that a church which boasts of so many distinguished members has so little red blood coursing through its life today. There are too many of these "Who's Who" Unitarians that are like the most distinguished member of my former New England Unitarian parish. He is one of the world's greatest living scientists, a truly distinguished man. During my four years as the minister of the church to which he contributes, I never saw him one time in the pews. I know of many other distinguished persons who are nominally members of the Unitarian church but who have no active connection with it. Indeed, while the people I have known in this church during ten years of service have been mostly good people, few of them have had any passion for beauty, truth or goodness. The people who really attend the Unitarian church today are not distinguished people at all for the most part. Yet the Unitarians rest much of their claim to superiority even today on the basis of the number of their membership that may be found in "Who's Who."

I make mention of these facts not to belittle the Unitarian church, for I have no desire to do that. What I am anxious to make clear is that the Unitarian church as it exists actually is not a group of persons who are actively engaged in the effort to realize the dream of a fellowship of free, passionate and living spirits, true above all things to themselves, yet joined in beautiful and sacred bonds of intellectual union. The Unitarian church is a sort of Rudyard Kipling in American religion; that is, it lives on as a glorious but fruitless and impotent symbol of a high dream and an eloquent hour. The sermons of its ministers today are like the recent books of Rudyard Kipling, the feeble expressions of a genius that is dead. There is no place for them, as Dr. Southworth would say, in a modern democracy. Yet I suppose that the Unitarian church will live a good while longer than Rudyard Kipling, and I write these words only "Lest we forget, Lest we forget" a majestic dream of a free church which haunts me still. RAYMOND H. PALMER.

Jottings

In answer to a petitioner who asked that the running of trains be stopped upon Sundays, the Inter-State Commerce Commission declared that the Constitution gave it no authority to enforce the Ten Commandments. This must be the reason why the Eighth Commandment is so easily broken by officers of government.

The Danubian Conference is dead, the Disarmament Conference is asleep, the Lausanne Conference threatens to be still-born. International conferences seem to be like the man whose widow inscribed upon his tombstone:

Meant Well
Tried Little
Failed Much

A bill recently introduced into Congress provides that all civil service appointees to government positions shall know and be able to sing the "Star Spangled Banner." This is so good it ought to be better! We move to amend the proposed law so that it will provide that all civil service appointees shall wear the flag as a uniform, read the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution at least once a day, and at least once a year make a pilgrimage to Philadelphia and kiss the floor of Independence Hall.

A recently deceased woman in New York left a will bequeathing $937,500 to the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, provided Bishop William T. Manning was dead when she died. If the Bishop were alive, the will provided that the money should pass to St. Luke's Hospital. Bishop Manning must be wondering if life is worth living. As for the Trustees of the Cathedral . . . !!

Prohibit prostitution? Yes! Opium and narcotics? Yes! Impure milk? Yes! Firearms? Yes! Liquor? Well—why not? What is there about liquor which should render it immune to the same prohibition which we apply to other recognized menaces to the health, happiness and security of the community?

We have a suspicion that the nations will strip themselves of arms when their citizens refuse to use them.

J. H. H.

The Sword of Damocles

[From Our Special Correspondent]

W. I. Hull, Swarthmore College, and I were sitting in the Press Gallery of the Glass-House, Geneva, while the Naval Commission of the Disarmament Conference was in session. Admirals, statesmen, flanked by experts, as advisers, were discussing ships, submarines, mines, chemicals, bacteria—seeking to agree upon which might be listed as offensive, specially dangerous to civilians or inhuman. They had their eyes down on their tables or looking at manuscripts.

During a translation, Mr. Hull said to me, "That reminds me of the sword of Damocles. You know, he was a courtier of the tyrant of Syracuse, Dionysius, who wishing to rebuke him for his flatteries, seated him at a luxurious banquet, over his head being suspended by a single horse-hair a keen-edged sword. Those men go on discussing range of guns, size of submarines, inhuman weapons and so forth—feasting, while impending disaster, like the sword of Damocles, hangs on a hair, above their heads." "That exactly describes a few things I'd like to say. You won't object to my using it for a caption, will you?" "Pleased to have you."

Since I returned to Geneva, ten days ago, I have attended conferences, commissions on air, land and sea weapons—having to do with the heavens above, the earth beneath and the waters under the earth—and the participants were as Damocles under a sword, suspended by a hair. They were asking, and asking again, What can we do about that sword? As I go on, I ask the reader to keep on raising the question: What shall be done with the sword? How can mankind, our Damocles, escape from war? How can the impending disaster be avoided?

The Three Days Debate—April 22-24. This debate was by the General Committee of the Disarmament Conference. It was started at the beginning of the session on the 22nd, by John Simon, head of the British delegation. He began by reading this resolution,

Without prejudice to other proposals which fall to be discussed under later heads of the agenda, the Conference declares its approval of the principle of qualitative disarmament; that is, the selection of certain classes or descriptions of weapons with a view to prohibiting by international convention their possession or use by any state.

If I had any doubt about Britain holding the dominant control in the Conference, it would have been dissipated by this discussion, led by John Simon. Where is the power there is the responsibility.

Simon argued, that many speakers had already spoken in favor of the principle—from Grandi to Gibson. He possesses a choice collection of flattering compliments. He reasoned that it was best to come to agreement on one principle, rather than try to push several carts through the same door. It would be better to decide on the principle of qualitative disarmament before proceeding to the discussion of quantitative.

Nadolny of Germany observed that his delegation would accept prohibition of offensive weapons, if equally applied. In fact, she had proved that it could be done.

Choumenkovitch of Yugoslavia felt that weapons of offense could be well used only in special cases with the League's authorization. The use of chemical and bacteriological weapons would call forth a feeling of revolt in the civilized world.

Grandi accepted the British resolution in its entirety. Italy attached great importance to qualitative disarmament. On the principle, if not on the method, it should be easy to secure unanimity.

Wilford of New Zealand said, "we have come to a mile-stone on the road to progress."

This ended the first day's debate.

The sword of Damocles still hung over this General Committee of 100.

The Second Day—April 21.

Perley of Canada favored the Simon resolution. Canada is opposed to big guns and aggressive weapons. Favors limitation.

Colban of Norway favored the principle of qualitative disarmament, but the application would need to be discussed later.

Boncour of France was grateful to Simon for his gracious words of yesterday, but he could not support the resolution in its present form. In fact, France

had been among the very first to favor the principle of qualitative disarmament. He felt that arms of a certain strength could be used by international direction. It was impossible to humanize war. France asked for a better formula than the one proposed. Gibson of the United States favored the Simon resolution. It would not be easy to apply the qualitative principle, for example to tanks, heavy guns and gas, but it would be found practicable, if desirable.

Lester of the Irish Free State did not believe that the principle of qualitative disarmament would interfere with internationalization.

TeWater of South Africa was the next one of the British family to speak. To him it looked as if it were possible to hope that the Conference was nearing results. He therefore supported the resolution unreservedly.

Aga Khan of India gave the approval of his country to the resolution. There must be an end to the pre-war armaments race, which would only produce fresh horrors. Sato of Japan favored the principle, but felt it was necessary to discriminate between weapons, and also situations.

Beelaerts van Blokland of the Netherlands and Shedden of Australia and D'Avila Lima of Portugal and Lo of China all favored adopting the qualitative principle.

China held that heavy guns, bombing planes, submarines and capital ships should be abolished.

Motta of Switzerland felt that the British proposal could be carried out in the form desired by the French delegation. The Conference should seek for unanimity.

Titulesco of Roumania then came forward with a resolution signed by thirteen states which he said would tend to make for unity. He asked that the whole matter be referred back to the drafting committee.

Litvinoff of Soviet Russia remarked that the last resolution instead of bringing harmony rather tended to disharmony. His delegation had long stood in favor of the qualitative principle.

So the second day closed with the Titulesco resolution immediately causing an adjournment until next day. *And, the sword of Damocles hung over them.*

The Third Day—April 22.

Simon was on deck bright and early. It looked as if the two days' debate would be for naught. Simon said that he had been pondering over the matter during the night. He observed that all were in favor of qualitative disarmament (of course no weapons had been agreed upon). He begged leave to introduce a few words, which would bring entire harmony. Objectionable weapons should be prohibited *or internationalized* by national convention. Thereupon, Titulesco, after much circumlocution, expressed himself as "satisfied." Tardieu, who had rushed over from Paris, after many words congratulated the Committee on the mutual understanding. Then Sato, Apponyi, Nadolny, Litvinoff and others, with many reservations, accepted the new text. One bridge had been crossed. It took three days.

One important question remained, the *method of applying* the principle of qualitative disarmament. Again, Simon came to the front and for two hours guided the discussion, until it was unanimously agreed to ask the Land, Sea and Air Commissions to decide what arms were the most offensive and threatening to civilian population, and the most aggressive. The commissions were instructed to get busy. And, the General Committee adjourned until April 27th! *The sword of Damocles still hung over them.*

On April 27th, the General Commission (this is practically the Conference) met for less than one hour! It met long enough to decide that it would not meet again until after Whitsuntide holidays, May 13-16. Elections, German and French disturb the waters. Meantime, the Special Commissions on Air, Sea and Land were urged to get busy on qualitative disarmament, Boncour of France giving the final hint that the question remained entirely open, whether limitation should be done by internationalization or prohibition! The irrepressible conflict! The divine deadlock!

An important week. The men have been here at this time, who have the most power to bring about disarmament. At one time, I saw Henderson, Simon and Drummond together. At another, Tardieu and Macdonald went out of the meeting, arm in arm. Stimson has been giving luncheons to the chief men of the Big Powers. Unquestionably this hobnobbing is all to the good. If nations are ever to get-together, their representatives must come together.

At times, it looks as if understanding was being arrived at between nations that had been at cross-purposes. Then, all at once, it blows up. Let me illustrate this by speaking of two interviews given to the Press.

1. *By Macdonald.* At Hotel Beau-Rivage, 7 o'clock. Two hundred newspapermen are there. Three secretaries attended him, and proved to be useful. He was "not to be quoted," he said, but liberty to write about the information he had come to impart was freely granted. The British government is interested in two things, the establishment of the *authority* of the League of Nations (quite believe this, the League is worth millions to the Empire; in fact, I am prepared to believe that it may grow into a kind of British political Vatican) and to *establish* peace and order in the world (it wouldn't surprise me if out of the Conference came a Pax Britannica). He was greatly disappointed (he looked so) at the long drawn out discussions in the Conference. Britain's chief arm is the Navy, but disarmament can come only through international agreement. All nations must come into the pool. He was greatly disappointed that the 5-Power agreement did not visualize. Also, that Tardieu by bad fate had been taken ill, and as a result important conferences had to be cancelled—with himself compelled to rush back to London for business and Stimson planning to return soon to Washington!

And, meanwhile, the sword of Damocles hangs on a thread.

In closing, he said what was a bit ominous, that if it was found to be impossible to get reductions from the nations, it should be noted that the clause in the London Treaty permitting increase was not a dead letter. In referring to Lausanne, he said that postponement was not a good policy. Situations must be faced squarely. The world ought not to be allowed to go down and down, so, by the end of twenty years, there would be no trade at all.

I was impressed by the three secretaries accompanying the Prime Minister. The British impress me as being the most highly organized group here (no other to compare). This makes them most formidable, helpful or dangerous. One of his secretaries, for example whispered to him. Macdonald smiled and remarked to the Press that he had said, Tardieu was ill by "bad

fate." He wished to make it clear that he *did not* say, "ill by *bad faith*." The British show excellent team play. It is instinct.

Macdonald came to the Press to express his disappointment over the disturbance to hopeful plans.

2. *By Bruening.* At the Hotel Metropole, 6:30 sharp. Two hundred of the Press were on hand. There was something on his mind, as on the mind of Macdonald. He had come back to Geneva not to engage in the general discussion, but to meet some responsible statesmen, in order to clarify the situation. He deeply regretted the illness of Tardieu. Germany's position was unchanged, in standing for equality and effective disarmament. The remedy must be partly psychological. There was lack of confidence. There must be international contact, especially between France and Germany. There was an intermediate state between war and peace, which must be sought, a state devoid of deception and delusion. (I hope Germany will stick to the principle of equality, as necessary to peace. This applies to America and Britain, as well as to France).

Meantime, the sword of Damocles hangs by a thread. What should be done?

An American Committee. A score of Americans meet with some regularity to "talk things over." This week, they seemed burdened about the Far East. Some held that there was little hope for disarmament in Geneva until the Japan-China matter was settled. Others insisted that the world could not wait for every brain-storm to subside. It is active in Japan today. It may be in France tomorrow; Germany, the day after. Meantime, the sword of Damocles hangs on a thread. (Again, in the Far East settlement, Britain is exercising the dominant power. There seems to be little doubt that Simon did not lay a restraining hand on Sato, in the long and many meetings of the Council. The heads of the two committees working in the Far East—at Shanghai and in Manchuria—are both British. This remark is made in order to locate *responsibility*). What Britain wants must always be taken into consideration when seeking solution of international problems. When Britain is willing to seek justice in the Far East, and willing really to disarm—there will be a long step taken in the solution of our troubles. I have not noticed any plan suggested by her that would result in any comparative reduction. Sometime, I wish to write about France, Britain and America at a Conference. I have seen enough to lead me to think that Americans are not keenly politically-minded and that France is not playing the role of "tough guy."

Meantime, the waters of the beautiful Rhône are flowing under the picturesque Geneva Bridges, and

The Sword of Damocles hangs over the Conference (and mankind) on a slender thread. What shall be done? Has the reader found the answer? Here is mine—an answer that has been forming itself day by day, night by night, as impressions have thronged my mind and stirred my soul,

The one thing to do about the sword is
Not to shorten or lengthen it
Not to sharpen or dull it
Not to decorate it with ribbons and garlands
Not to gild it
Not to worship it
But to abolish it—to pitch it out the window.
This means total disarmament now—as only guaranteeing security and equality.

The Sword of Damocles, that hangs by a thread over the world—what should be done with it?

SYDNEY STRONG.

Geneva, Switzerland.

A Case of Mistaken Strategy

Unquestionably, the Socialist Party this year would have polled a phenomenal vote but for the action taken by the Milwaukee convention in demanding the repeal of the 18th Amendment, and pledging Socialist officials, if elected, to put the government into the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor. Irrespective of the morals involved, the present attitude of the Socialist Party toward Prohibition, in this writer's opinion, is a tragic political mistake.

Liberal leaders of Socialism in this country, who are more liberal than Socialistic, took occasion to capitalize the propaganda of the "wets" by forcing this issue upon the Milwaukee convention. For disastrous results, as far as getting votes is concerned, they might as well have pledged the Party for or against religion.

The Socialist Party, strange to say, has a much better promise of increasing its strength and prestige in the small town and country districts than in the cities where dwell the industrial working class and the slum proletariat. This latter vote, in large measure, is subject to purchase and intimidation; until the revolution breaks, that vote is likely to continue to be cast for the political party whose leaders command the largest purse, or whose dictation of the industrial situation is most complete. If any radical party makes an inroad here, it threatens to be the Communist rather than the Socialist Party. Americans reside more largely in the small town and country districts; their vote is more or less independent; and it is a fact which all observers will confirm that much of this independent American vote this fall would have gone Socialistic, had it not been for the action of the Milwaukee convention.

After the Chicago conventions have adjourned it will be discovered, in all probability, that one of the old parties will be either officially "wet," or its candidate will be a "wet"; while the other party and candidate will be sufficiently "dry" to induce all Prohibitionists to wage an aggressive campaign for victory. Knowing that the Socialist Party has no chance of winning at the polls, and disinclined to subscribe to the economic demands of Socialism, the majority of the "wets," ignoring the bait held out by the Milwaukee convention, will vote, as usual, with and for that old party through which it is hoped the repeal of Prohibition will be effected. Real thinkers in all parties prophesy, propaganda to the contrary, that that political party which is nearest "dry" will be the winner in November.

While Communists and class-conscious folk will sneer at the statement, it is a fact that individuals of a religious turn cast the dominating vote in this country. This religious vote, admittedly, but unconsciously,

takes dictation from the political and financial agents of the ruling class, but with it all it remains the majority vote. Since the beginning of the depression the religious press and large numbers of preachers and priests, economically speaking, have been veering toward the left. Several major conferences held recently by outstanding religious denominations have gone on record as being opposed to capitalism and all its works. It is known that a sizable number of gospel advocates have declared that the only remedy they know for the evils of capitalism is Socialism. Many of them were prepared to stand with the Socialist Party in the impending campaign. The resolution for the repeal of the 18th Amendment by the Milwaukee convention has cost the Socialist Party this religious press and preacher strength, and lost the party much of the religious vote.

There is a mighty radical sentiment in the United States, but it is politically unregistered. In a revolutionary uprising the individuals behind that sentiment, millions of them, undoubtedly will emerge to man the barricades, but in the forthcoming election they won't because they can't vote. On the other hand, nearly every religious person in the country, including grandmother and grandfather, is registered, and for a purpose—which is to kill with their votes, irrespective of party affiliation or party prejudice, any and every attempt by the "wets" to restore the liquor traffic.

Consider the recent Los Angeles mayoralty recall election. John C. Porter, undisputed champion of the Power Trust, enemy of free speech and free assemblage, and the one outstanding official who has done less than any other to bring relief to the city's starving poor, received a majority vote of 20,000 over the combined total of his opponents, any one of whom was an abler man offering a program of action much superior to the discreditable record of the incumbent who was returned to office. Why?

For some reason the people are obsessed with the notion that Porter is a religious man and a faithful guardian of the people's interests in the matter of enforcing Prohibition. Libertarians, as a rule, do not register and do not vote. Most religious persons do. On election day large numbers of friends of municipal ownership and political reform failed to vote. Every member of Bob Shuler's Trinity Methodist Church and Mrs. McPherson-Hutton's Angelus Temple was out in force on election day, with every other religious person in Los Angeles, working to keep John C. Porter at the head of the city's government.

Los Angeles is not a metropolitan city; it is a great big overgrown small town. The people who live here accurately reflect the mentality and attitude of small town people the nation over who control the nation's vote. These people are determined never to permit the repeal of the 18th Amendment. Any political party which comes out openly against National Prohibition is committing political suicide. And that applies to the Socialist Party.

A tragic mistake has been made by the Milwaukee convention.

GEORGE H. SHOAF.

Thoughts About Europe

One of the largest audiences of Americans ever assembled in Berlin packed the American Church last summer when John Haynes Holmes preached here just before returning to America. "I am returning home discouraged, almost disillusioned," he said. Then Dr. Holmes proceeded to plead for the only thing that can bind up such running wounds as those of Europe—an overplus of love. There is a characteristic Christian spirit of sacrificial love, of turning the other cheek, of going the second mile, of giving both cloak and coat. This differentia is sadly lacking in modern Christians, however. "Take fifty Christians and fifty non-Christians off the street. Mix them together. There is practically no difference." But Jesus exemplified and demanded a unique, overflowing devotion. Without this what do we more than others? Only such a spirit can save the modern world. So spoke Dr. Holmes.

A year has passed since that memorable Sunday. Europe is even more ghastly in its selfishness and paralyzing fears. Let us swing from land to land for a moment. What thoughts crowd in!

England is battling her way upwards after a terrific economic and social disaster. One cannot help admiring the honesty and character of Britain's attitude to her post-war debts. She forgave some of her Allies' debts to her, and without the hypocrisy of reparation-prerequisites has been meeting her obligations to America. England had her share in bringing on the 1914 conflagration. She always has attempted to curb any European power which loomed too dangerously as an economic or political rival. Sir Edward Grey signed over the British navy to France before Belgium was invaded. When Germany openly asked him if England would remain neutral provided Belgium was not invaded, he refused to answer in the affirmative. England could have prevented the war. The British, as well as the other allied countries, went into the war as an economic venture. Some real effort and financial outlay is worth the price if one's most dangerous rival can thereby be crippled. The European business men didn't realize what after-effects on themselves this extermination of a deadly rival was to involve. But England's conscious or unconscious attitude is: We risked. We borrowed. We nearly lost everything. But our creditor came in with fresh morale and two million soldiers to save his investments, so by the skin of our teeth we were victors instead of vanquished. It wasn't a fortunate enterprise, but we gambled, so let's pay the piper. England knows that if Germany had won the war the world would have been as safe (yes, even safer) for democracy as now. Germany's constitutional monarchy was one of the most democratic governments in the world; whereas now, a condition has been created in which a group of politicians and militarists in nearly every land are rearing fortifications, fears, hatreds and tariff walls worse than the most autocratic dictates of the autocrats. Was it not an ancient Psalmist who spoke of God sitting in his heavens and laughing?

Italy, for example, is one product of the war to make the world safe for democracy! Italy is many ways better off under her iron-fisted dictatorship than before the war. But she is hardly a democracy! She has no freedom of speech, no personal liberty, for example. But she does have slumless cities, beggarless streets and trains that run fairly on schedule—all of

which are innovations for Italy. Theoretically Fascism is a curse; practically it has done its share in serving humanity through the centuries. Mussolini is working for peace and international common sense more than a great many European statesmen one might name.

France is indeed the spoiled child of the world. Surely she is no exception to the rule that all countries are provincial and self-seeking. Here as in Japan one finds the sad illustration of the people feeling one way and things "somehow" going another way. No, I am not Hamiltonian; I follow Jefferson and Lincoln, but with war-thirsty propaganda of "security" (world safe for democracy) still ringing in my ears. When I travel in France I find the French fine, normal people, interested above all in avoiding anything, war included, which would interfere with their simple life enjoyments. They have only a meager understanding of European history. They remember two German invasions, and forget that they invaded Germany ruthlessly and often just before these reciprocities. They are as all observers testify logical but nearsighted. Little do they realize that their grim policy of keeping Germany bled white will poison their own souls as well as goad a more powerful neighbor to an unspeakably ghastly war of revenge.

Russia goes on with her mysterious, fascinating, crushing experiment. Hers is a noble end, and inexcusably horrible means. There is no unemployment in Russia, but there is little to eat. Rubles they all have, but nowhere to spend them. The secret of their failure is that their boys are not brought up on mechanical toys. I mean this seriously. Americans are naturally mechanical. We grow up with toy tool chests, erector sets, bicycles and red seal batteries. Practically every American engineer in Russia (there are few left now as compared to a year ago) has aged ten years just because of the strain in trying to get the Russian to understand the simplest uses of the monkey-wrench. But Russia is on her way. She will learn. And even though she refuses to say Lord, Lord, she goes ahead with her great ideal of the state as the complete servant of society. All countries of this world, however rich and prosperous now, may well regulate their economic system with the masses in mind, or the uprising will inevitably come in them that has come in Russia. It is not the nature of masses of the people to remain in involuntary servitude, especially educated masses.

Germany is in birth pains and death throes at the same time. The recent Prussian diet election shows that at last ultra-radicalism has secured the helm in Germany. The root of the matter is a treaty "conceived in revenge and heavy with hatred," to use Fosdick's phrase. Let me illustrate how this works psychologically. Injustice always is a cancer which works into the life tissue. The city of Berlin leveled a technically possible but utterly outrageous tax of $2,500 on the American Church in Berlin. We fought for our very existence, incensed beyond measure, since human beings in normal circumstances would never stoop to such Shylockry. Finally the office of highest appeal announced with gracious magnanimity that they would compromise and reduce their demand by 70 per cent. But raising $800 seems as impossible to us as the original amount. Why? We have no money on the one hand, but even more so because it is not *just*. We pay taxes right and left as it is. So it is with Germany. Reductions and compromises on the Versailles Treaty help but little. They still remain stigmatized as a criminal nation. The nation which is now trying to define article 231 as not attributing sole responsibility to Germany has just succeeded in torpedoing the Disarmament Conference because she refuses to talk unless it can be in terms of radical inequality for Germany. Anyone who understands psychology knows that a sensitive, cultured people like the Germans cannot long endure such a surrounding atmosphere without going bitter and then mad.

America, and what shall we say of her? You are a young nation. Let no man despise thy youth. Youth is not cynical, but hopeful; not weary, but boundless of energy. Keep sending your message over to Europe that the world is yet young, and that the greatest discoveries, the sweetest joys of life, the largest ventures into the realm of thought and spirit are ahead, not in the silent past.

EWART EDMUND TURNER.

American Church, Berlin, Germany.

The Bureaucrat at the Dinner Table

[Professor Edward Thompson is known to some Americans for his attack on Dr. Sutherland's "India in Bondage," printed here in pamphlet form and shipped to the States as part of the anti-Indian propaganda carried on by our Government and its friends in America.

Thompson has now written in the *Spectator* of April 9th an article entitled "New Light on Amritsar," attempting to white-wash General Dyer. His evidence consists of some conversations at dinner with British bureaucrats in India. According to this "new light" Dyer's massacre of a peaceful crowd of Indians at Jalianwalabagh was a "mistake." He continued firing in ignorance that there was no outlet from the place. Afterwards he was "dazed and broken up." At the Hunter enquiry, however, he "clean forgot" all this and boasted of his deliberate brutality.]

And so, Professor, it appears
(After the lapse of thirteen years)
That Dyer was both just and good
But (like the Saints) misunderstood;
So those whose sons and fathers fell,
Trapped helpless in that narrow Hell,
Reading these words that I have read,
Surely they shall be comforted. . . .

Only I wish that you'd explain
For what grim crime these men were slain,
Or *how* a pious general makes
Such curious (and *prolonged*) "mistakes,"
Or how this martyr "clean forgot"
The reason why his soldiers shot,
Or how a murderer can repent,
Then wildly boast of the event . . .
Or could you tell us all, perhaps,
The reason for the years' elapse
Before officialdom enquired?
Or why this "hero" was admired?
Or on what pension he retired?

Professor, pray when next you feast
With Empire Builders in the East,
Let your post-prandial talk include
These matters to which I allude:
Or, mindful of your country's fame,
Let silence seal your lips in shame.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

The Study Table

War's Horrors

Some years ago there was published in Germany a terrific volume entitled "Krieg Dem Kriege"! This book of some two hundred and fifty pages consisted of an array of photographs showing the horrors of the battlefield and the hospital—ghastly pictures of wrecked villages, dead bodies, rotting corpses, burial trenches, mutilated heads and faces, raped women, and other things too hideous to mention. To go through this book required an effort of will and a sheer nerve which were almost impossible. But these were the facts of war, and why should they not be known? An American editor, Frederick A. Barber, has now prepared an American book* of the same kind. This recent publication is obviously based upon its German predecessor. It contains a few of the same pictures, reproduces the same incredible horrors, and is thus directed to the same end. It is also edited in much the same way—with introductions, written in this case by Harry Emerson Fosdick and Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, with accompanying poems and paragraphs from war literature, and with unfailingly effective captions. The book is less complete and much less shocking than the German publication, perhaps because Mr. Barber felt that the American public, so much farther removed from the late war than the German public, could not stand the full dose of gruesome agony, but it is bad enough, and we can imagine that many a reader will lay it down with a curdling of the blood and sudden nausea of the stomach before he gets through.

We welcome books of this kind, and only wish that those who ought to see them could be made to see them. If we had our way, we would take every last militarist by the nape of the neck and would force him to study every one of these pictures until he fainted from sheer disgust and loathing. As Dr. Fosdick puts it, "If the militarists want realism, we will give it to them." But there still remains the question as to whether the terror and misery of war can ever be presented as an effective argument against it. Those who have seen war in all its naked ghastliness, either at first or second hand, will of course never plunge into it again. But the generation that fights the "next war" is always the generation which has never witnessed the experience of arms for itself. Furthermore, can anything good or lasting be accomplished through appeal to the motive of fear? What these books attempt to do is to frighten the public so terribly, to horrify them so incredibly, that they will revolt from war as from a fearful pestilence. But human nature does not in the long run work this way! It is one of the glories of human nature that it refuses to be afraid, and, if it thinks a thing good or justifiable or unavoidable, will grit its teeth and see it through. In recent years we have had dozens of books of the "All Quiet on the Western Front" type. We have had moving pictures which have concealed no ugliness and terror of the battlefield. But we cannot see that the mind of man is greatly changed. At bottom, there is a fascination about horror which draws us to it whether we will or no. So we feel some confusion about this whole business. At the least it must be said that this line of attack, however effective, cannot of itself destroy war. There must be a pacifist advance along the whole front if we are to establish a durable peace upon the earth.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*"The Horror of It," by Frederick A. Barber. Published by Brewer, Warren and Putnam. $2.00.

A Book of Poems

This cordial invitation greets you informally from the fly-leaf of the bright yellow cover on "Dreamers' House."

Ralph Cheyney and Lucia Trent are at home. Step in and enjoy their poet's fare—songs of home, children, nature and love—served between book covers.

And informally you react! You walk in and find the two poets quite at home—with the gracious reception that one may expect from these two singing lovers who have been called "the Brownings of America."

Ralph Cheyney and Lucia Trent live, and love, in poetry. They live for poetry, and their kind of love—is poetry. In his excellent introduction to "Dreamers' House" Glenn Ward Dresbach says: "They first worked together on *Contemporary Verse*. They fell very much in love and were married—and are still very much in love. . . . And when they write of love they write of love that has endured through pain and struggle. . . . Two loving, married poets—singing together—not afraid to be human and to show that they love each other even in song." They are managing editors of *Poetry World and Contemporary Vision* and poetry editors of UNITY. Their previous books have evoked praise from the greatest critics and poets.

And their "poet's fare" in "Dreamers' House?" The twin-volume contains almost an equal number of poems by these well-known singers, with the initials of the author listed in the index. It is interesting, when reading a poem, to judge whether it is Lucia's or Ralph's—then refer to the index to learn if your "guess" is correct. Many of these poems are reprinted from leading periodicals, and from highly praised anthologies. Included also is "Empty Dusk," with which Lucia Trent won a *Gypsy* prize for 1930, awarded by John Galsworthy; and also "Ancient Query, Modern Creed," by Ralph Cheyney, which won a *Stratford Magazine* prize for 1931.

The spirit of the poetry in "Dreamers' House" is like a breath of April—the breath of the warm furrow and starry blossoms—in this day when sensational festering vulgarism is too often mistaken for realism and ultra-modernism. Their songs of love—charged with the lofty ennobling passion of man and woman—are like a "blast of clean, wholesome, ancient morality." They breathe with the pure, intense beauty of life, of highly cultivated moral and intellectual standards. In the poems "Bridge of Dreams," "You Have Such Magic," "Beyond Frail Touch," "Our Love Is Older Than We," one is, in truth, strongly reminded of that lofty ennobling love which inspired the songs of Robert and Elizabeth Browning; of whose love Huxley wrote: "Love, after all, is the new invention; promiscuous lust geologically old-fashioned. The really modern people . . . are the Brownings."

Laying "Dreamers' House" aside, and making no attempt to memorize any of the verses, I was surprised to find how many of them I had retained. The poems

*"Dreamers' House." By Ralph Cheyney and Lucia Trent. Published by Robert Packard and Company, Chicago. 1931.

in this book have that mystical singing quality. I could quote "Empty Dusk" and "Credo in Blue" in their entirety. And these lines of "Scars of Wisdom"—the poem I never want to forget. . .

Our luminous lives now symbols to assert
How beautiful this union after hurt.

The title poem is particularly fascinating for its significant wit. . .

With creamy unicorn
For docile household pet,
How can a mortal-born
Expect prim etiquette?

In "My Children Sleep," "Bedtime," "Twin Boys," "At the Nursery Door" we have the heart of Lucia Trent—the "singing mother." Both of the poets rise to great heights in poems to their children. Glenn Dresbach need not tell us . . . . "when they write of home and children they write from intimate knowledge and affection. . ." We feel the deep spiritual quality in these lines of "Young Daughter," written to young Lucia by her mother. . .

You lie beside me through this twilight hour
So softly, like an uncurled flower—
My hope made manifest,
The lovely quest
Of woman. . . .
May you be all I never could become. . .

And in "Father-Love". . .

Let all my father-love that's washed by healing wells
Of children's joy and laughs cascading round as bells
Not shrink from any baby, even Ishmael's.

Then I shall know all errors merely childish dearth,
Perceive we live as yet upon a baby earth—
In reverence before the miracle of birth.

"Comrade Jesus" contains these lines which ring in the echo of all footfalls since I read them. . .

Oh, lonely feet! Oh, bleeding feet!
In step with mine on city street.

The longest poem in "Dreamers' House" is "Ancient Query, Modern Creed," and in this Ralph Cheyney's deep meditative strain reaches the peak of all his work in this volume. I would like to quote all the stanzas of this very worthy poem, yet must be content with only one. . .

Where change alone is sure, why not this creed:
The present is cocoon, the earth a seed,
And beauty answers when we stop to heed?
And may I ask, *why not this creed?*

To all those people who believe in Beauty, who believe in Love, who believe in Truth, I commend the visit to "Dreamers' House" as a source of continual joy and inspiration.

ROBERT BURNS BAIR.

Do We Need Religion?

Ernest Fremont Tittle, in his valuable little book,* answers the question in your reviewers superscription in the affirmative and makes out not only a plausible but a convincing case.

Mr. Tittle's point of view is refreshing. It is marked by a modern viewpoint, yet consecrated by the fire of faith. Six chapters of the book were originally lectures delivered as the Wilkin lectures under the auspices of the Wesley Foundation at the University of Illinois. And there are four additional! Of the ten, those on "Religion and Happiness," "Religion and Armaments" and "What Is Spirituality?" are of especial significance.

"Religion, is to happiness so essential that without it no deep and abiding happiness is ever likely to be found." This is the thesis of the chapter on "Religion and Happiness," and its philosophy is a plea for a synthesis between culture and faith, which it is a joy to endorse.

"Religion and Armaments" is a strong chapter. There is nothing unique in it but generally accepted viewpoints are expressed in virile, convincing, and charming fashion. A sentence quotation will suffice,

Unless reckless economic rivalry can be replaced by intelligent economic cooperation the specter of war will continue to haunt the councils of government and the imagination of mankind.

Spirituality defined as "aliveness to all true values" is the dominant note of the last chapter on "What Is Spirituality?" What a fine terse statement this is. If it were possible for all of us to be alive to true values, what a different social and economic structure we might rear!

While Dr. Tittle writes from the avowedly Christian viewpoint there is little in this book that may not be endorsed by any adherent of other faiths. The book constitutes a stimulating and charming series of preachments upon vital problems in connection with religion and its relation to contemporary life.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

*"We Need Religion," by Ernest Fremont Tittle. Published by Henry Holt & Co., New York City. $1.50.

Correspondence

From a Gandhi Disciple—In Jail!

Dear Dr. Holmes:

You will be surprised to receive this from me. I cut up my quarterly letter-sheet—jail rules allow one letter every three months to a "c" class prisoner!—into tiny bits and here is your share, more as a token of remembrance than anything else. You must have received my last note which I scribbled out immediately after I received the intelligence that I was "wanted." The same night as I was proceeding to the Ashram after my day's work I was taken charge of between one and two. They however showed me the courtesy to accompany me to the Ashram where I was able to take leave of my mother. By the way, since then she too has followed us in our steps—the latest vicissitude—what an experience in the evening of her life!

As I write this a circus company's band is making a terrible din in the neighborhood of this prison. A wedding party's merry clangor is mingling with it in the darkness of a summer night, with an eerie weird effect. Both combine to keep off one's mind from the dinginess, the bugs and the mosquitoes—the inevitable comrades. But we are most of us, as you know, fairly old jail-birds, and personally, the predominant feeling in my mind, after the breathless rush and hurry of the past months to which you were witness, is that of a truant school-boy making the most of his precarious holiday. I have just finished reading M. Rolland's studies of Vivekarnanda and Rama Krishna and the one exclamation that rises to my lips is "God, bless thee, Pilgrim of Humanity. Thou art marvellous." So rich is his sympathy, so deep his intuitive insight and understanding, so wide his comprehension. What lends additional interest to these studies is the incidental glimpse that they afford of the author's own spirit. No wonder that Bapu exclaimed after meeting him, "Rolland is a sage and a *tapasvi*." I am at present going on with a couple of books that the Rollands gave me as souvenirs of our stay with them at Villeneuve. I had a great desire to dive deep into Thoreau this time. But, as you know, the events moved so fast on our landing here that I had no time to get together my scattered books and papers. They had naturally all got disorganized as a result of our hurricane departure to London and now almost everybody who knows anything about them is in prison.

As I write these closing lines my mind flies to Yervada

where Bapu (Gandhi) must just now be getting ready to go to sleep under the starry sky, and every detail of those surroundings—rendered so clear—that I shared with him last time stands out vividly and clearly before the mind's eye. And then in the process of thinking of him and you I seem suddenly transported to that little terrace in the Kingsley Hall, London, and those little talks that we had. Here I must stop. . . . Write to me whenever you wish and can, and if there is anything which you think I ought to read, send it also to me at Ashram address. P.

"Looking Backward"

Editor of UNITY:

In the issue of May second there appeared a letter from Arthur Heineman of Bellingham, Washington, which will no doubt interest many as it does me. I read the two books referred to in 1918 and was so impressed by them that I bought six copies of "Looking Backward" and have been lending them ever since. I have given many copies of this book to friends and have often recommended it to readers of library books. Not every one has been as keen about it as I have been, but I have yet to hear any one say that our present social system is anything like as good as the one Bellamy had worked out. I had not waked up to the idea of organizing readers of these books, but it strikes me as being a move in the right direction and I would like to hear from other interested persons.

ERMINA MOORE.

South Haven, Michigan.

The "Movies" and Peace

Editor of UNITY:

So many millions of us are "movie fans," so many millions of us go at least once a week to the hundreds of thousands of motion picture theatres which regularly flash news reels of current events upon the silver screen, that I wonder whether it is not an important immediate task for those of us who are pacifists to do whatever we can to persuade the motion-picture industry to pay less attention to military activities, at least in news photographs.

Actual war "talkies" may be good pacifist propaganda. But, though I confess to being a confirmed movie-goer, it is hard for me to recall a single group of animated news photographs which failed to include scenes of military maneuvers of some kinds, whether nautical, aerial or of parade character, American or foreign. And I cannot help but feel that this military stress stamps public attention on war preparations as a normal and proper subject of interest in a way that is inimical to peace and progress.

Although I suspect that this emphasis is deliberate propaganda in the interests of munitions manufacturers and the War Department, it may be due chiefly to the fact that producers and exhibitors feel that such scenes provide a "good show." Often they are spectacular, which makes them all the worse in effect. My boredom at nine out of ten of such news releases may be an unusual reaction, although I doubt it. But whatever the motive, the effect is to increase immeasurably the difficulty of our struggle to abolish armies and end war. Grant that we must strike deeper to reach the causes of militarism and wholesale murder, should we not do what we can toward eliminating news reels glorifying "preparedness"?

What can we do? I don't know. (Do you?) But I should think that we might well endeavor to influence the many bodies interested in better films such as the National Film Estimate Service, General Federation of Women's Clubs, International Federation of Catholic Alumnae, Women's University Club of Los Angeles, and Film Service of the *Parents' Magazine,* though scarcely the D. A. R.! We could also protest to the motion picture producers, chief exhibiting chains and, as individuals, to the managers of our local motion picture houses. We might more advantageously base our protests on other grounds than pacifism, say boredom. Our efforts might not prove wholly successful, but here is one place where even a partial victory, resulting in but a slight abatement of this evil, is so much clear gain. Much time and effort need not be deflected from more important campaigns to accomplish this step toward our goal. . . How do you feel about it? What will you do? How can I help you do it?

RALPH CHEYNEY.

Philadelphia, Pa.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 226)

They understand me better because I speak their language. I speak to them about their degraded condition. I do not speak about God. I feel that I take the message of God to them in this particular manner just as to a starving man I take the message of God through the bread I give him. I have no axe to grind. I must not exploit him; I just give him the bread. If I want to convey God to the 'untouchable' I must take Him in the way that he needs. I go to the 'untouchables' and say, 'What God can I give you unless it is what you need?' If I were a Christian missionary (and I can enter into the hearts of Christian missionaries) I would go into their midst as Elwin has gone. He is today planning to work among the 'untouchables.' He will establish Christian ashrams among the 'untouchables,' with a church in a mud hut for his own and his colleagues' use. He wants simply to live among them as God may guide his life."

The Rev. C. E. Wilson, of the Baptist Missionary Society, said:

"To me the religious life may be simply described as a life of discipleship. We are all learners. The true missionary claims to be a disciple, with a trust to carry out the commission of his Lord, and to persuade others to be disciples. Mr. Gandhi seems to me to deprecate, almost to condemn, religious teaching. We are to go and live among people but not try to make them disciples or instil new faith into them. That seems to me to confute Mr. Gandhi's whole life. Does Mr. Gandhi mean that it is not right for us to go to India or any place and try to make people disciples, to teach the supreme truth of Jesus Christ if we believe Him to be the highest that we know? Mr. Gandhi has been preaching to us today. Does he really mean to exclude all preaching?"

Mr. Gandhi:

"Language fails to convey meaning; the uttered word is the limitation of thought. There is room for both writing and speech, though I find it would often be better if I wrote and spoke less; but I do not seek to convert anybody to my faith. Though my conviction is strong enough in me for me to die for that conviction, that force does not carry me to the goal of believing that the same thing would be believed by my fellow men. I know what God wishes for me, but I am not so presumptuous as to believe that I know what God wishes for others. Religious truth comes to us mysteriously. How did sudden upheaval come to Paul and others? Religion is a matter that must be left to God. I do not say 'no religious teaching'; bring up a man to the highest light his own faith has to give him. I know how impertinent it is for an utter stranger to speak to those to whom the message of the Bible is sacred as life itself. I am speaking to you as a seeker after God, just as you also are seekers after God. I am sharing with you my own experience, and trying to show you as fellow workers that probably if you could see eye to eye with me your work would flourish more and more. You have amazing self-sacrifice; you are great organizers; you are good men. I want to multiply occasions for your service. I want to work closer with you, but I do not want you to get India to change her faith."

The Rev. W. H. G. Holmes, of the Oxford Mission of Calcutta:

"I was in the south of India walking with some Indian students across a path which lay through a field. As we approached a group of Indians they suddenly withdrew to a distance of about 40 yards into the middle of the field. I went up to these Indians and asked why they had done this. They did this because they feared we were Brahmins, and therefore they must remove themselves. I then said they need not have done that for us because we were Christians, and regarded them as our brothers, and there was a Father in Heaven to whom they were just as dear as we were. They answered me—'These are good words; will you please come to our village and open a school there?' Would we be right in going to teach them about this Father, who I told them loved them as dearly as he loved

us, and would Mr. Gandhi encourage them to let us have land to build on in order to teach these people?"

Mr. Gandhi:

"Yes, I would, on one condition—that you will teach them the religion of their fathers through the religion they have got. Don't say to them 'The only way to know the Father is our way.' God is Father to the 'untouchable,' to all of us, but a Father who appears to you in another garb. Show the 'untouchable' the Father as he appears in his surroundings. Unless you are satisfied that we do not know the real Father at all, and then of course it is your duty to say—'What you know as Father is no Father at all. What you believe comes from Satan.' I sometimes receive letters saying that I am a good man, but that I am doing the devil's work. I feel I adore the same Father though in a different form. I may not adore him as 'God.' To me that name makes no appeal, but when I think of him as Rama, He thrills me. To think of God as 'God' does not fire me as the name Rama does. There is all the poetry in it. I know that my forefathers have known him as Rama. They have been uplifted for Rama, and when I take the name of Rama I arise with the same energy. It would not be possible for me to use the name 'God' as it is written in the Bible. It is so contrary to experience. I should not be attracted. I should not be lifted to the truth. Therefore my whole soul rejects the teaching that Rama is not my God. Go to the 'untouchables'; give them schools; give them all, but not with your idea in the back of your mind. If anyone were able to show me that God the Father had to be approached in one particular way, I would not hesitate a moment; I would go to the whole world, but my life would have to be re-written. I have no disciples except myself, and he is a terrible one. I have followers, but I do not feel that they are disciples. My search is for peace, and to show God through the life I live. I give myself to my fellowmen. This is the secret of peace and happiness also."

—Quaker World Service.

A Contest for Best Peace Plank

College students all over the country are being given an opportunity to tell seasoned politicians what to put into their party platforms. A contest has been launched, under the auspices of the "To Chicago" plan, open to all college and university undergraduates, for the best plank on World Peace to be included in the Democratic and Republican platforms of this year. A prize of ten dollars is offered by the Peace Committee of Sinai Temple Sisterhood, and will be awarded on June 14 at the Municipal Pier. In the Art Assembly on that day a program for young people will be given—first, a short play, entitled "Greater Than the Sword," then the poem, "Malediction Against War," read by the author, George Dillon, winner of the Pulitzer Prize for Poetry, and finally the prize awarded by some visiting celebrity. All manuscripts for the peace plank contest should be sent to Rev. Rudolph Joop, 2108 Iowa Ave., Chicago, as soon as possible. Particulars of the contest may be obtained from Mr. Joop.

La Follette's
National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE
Subscription Price $1.50 Per Year

In every issue it is fighting your battles against unscrupulous and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
3 Months
— 13 —
ISSUES
20c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 20 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B, Madison, Wis.

TO UNITY READERS

Greetings from a like minded person who has a delightful country place on the East shore of Lake Michigan which she would like to share with you.

One hundred or more people can be accommodated—an ideal spot for group conferences on social questions.

If interested write—

ERMINA MOORE
Syringa Bluff South Haven, Mich.

The May-June issue of
The New Humanist

Containing:

OF THEE I SING
by Frank Lloyd Wright

TWO SONNETS
by Hugh Robert Orr

DOCTRINAL FUNCTIONS AND RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES
By Cassius J. Keyser

A NEW MIDWESTERN FRONTIERSMAN
by E. T. Knower

A STUDENT OF DILTHEY
by Hans-Joachim Schoeps

TRAGIC AMERICA
by Carl Henry Grabo

SPECIAL OFFER

The New Humanist ($1.00 *yearly; 20c a copy*) *will be sent in combination with any of the following books at reduced prices (regular price of book in brackets) The New Humanist for one year*

With: Sir James Jeans "The Mysterious Universe" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: Norman Thomas, "As I See It" ($2.00) $2.50
With Twenty-two Authors "Living Philosophies" ($2.50)—$2.75
With: Curtis Reese "Humanist Religion" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: A. E. Haydon "The Quest of the Ages" ($3.50)—$3.00
With: Walter Lippmann "A Preface to Morals" ($1.00)—$1.65

If book you want is not listed here, send for prices. Please send check or money order, otherwise books will be mailed C. O. D. All orders must be placed with

THE NEW HUMANIST
14 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio

Just Out

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry
of Sir Walter Scott
With a Critical Introduction,
By
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press
114 Fifth Avenue New York City